Annex No 6 to the Guidelines for applicants of the open call “Supporting local cultural entrepreneurship” under the EEA financial mechanism programme “Culture” 2014-2021”

**PROJECT BENEFIT AND QUALITY EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

1. **General information on the application:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Code of the application |  |
| Title of the application |  |
| Title of the Applicant |  |

1. **Evaluation criteria:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item No** | **Evaluation criteria** | **Main Aspects of Evaluation** | **Scale** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.** | The project has a strong social and/or community dimension | Higher rating shall be given to those projects which have strong social / community aspect  Points to be taken into consideration during the evaluation (non-exhaustive list):   * Adaptation to community needs (especially for social risk groups); * The aim is to solve specific community problems (social exclusion, unemployment, problems of social groups, etc.); * Provision of educational events and trainings for locals; * Active community involvement in different stages of the project; * Increased access of local communities to culture due to project's activities; * The community is involved in creating a cultural / creative / artistic product or service; * Involvement of locals - consultations with the community and stakeholders are foreseen or have been carried out already; * Project involves local communities into development and dissemination of activities. | 0 – The project has no social/ community dimension;  5 – The project has a weak social/ community dimension;  10 – The project has some social/ community dimension;  15 - The project has a strong social/ community dimension. |  |
| **2.** | The project is being implemented in areas remote from the centers of major cities | * Higher rating shall be given to those projects which are being implemented in areas remote from the centers of major cities. | 0 - project activities are implemented in the territories of old towns of the biggest cities (Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda), which are determined by valid documents of the Real Cultural Heritage Register[[1]](#footnote-2)  5 - project activities are implemented in the territories of the biggest cities (Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda) (except for their old towns, territories of which are determined by valid documents of the Real Cultural Heritage Register1)  10 - project activities are implemented in the territories of Alytus city, Panevėžys city, Šiauliai city (including their old towns)  15- project activities are implemented in the territories other than listed above. |  |
| **3.** | Cultural / creative / artistic value of the project | Higher rating shall be given to those projects which have higher cultural / creative / artistic value.  Points to be taken into consideration (non-exhaustive list):   * The project has high artistic / creative /cultural value; * Project's activities include local artists. | 0 – The project has no cultural / creative / artistic value;  5 – The project has little cultural / creative / artistic value;  10 – The project has strong cultural / creative / artistic value;  15 – The project has very high cultural / creative / artistic value. |  |
| **4.** | Entrepreneurial aspect of the project | Higher rating shall be given to those projects which have stronger entrepreneurial aspect. The evaluation of this criterion does not take into account mandatory trainings in cultural entrepreneurship.  Points to be taken into consideration (non-exhaustive list):   * Description of planned product or service and evaluation of the market is provided; * Product or service branding vision are foreseen; * Preliminary pricing is provided; * SWOT analysis is conducted; * Customer target groups are described; * The project is planning to attract tourists. | 0 – The project does not have an entrepreneurial dimension;  5 – The project has certain entrepreneurial aspects;  10 – The project has strong entrepreneurial aspects;  15 – The project has a very strong entrepreneurial dimension. |  |
| **5.** | Sustainability of the project | Higher rating shall be given to those projects which are oriented towards sustainable results and continuity of activities.  Points to be taken into consideration (non-exhaustive list):   * The project is socially open, and the results are easily accessible to the public; * Project is foreseen in stages, with presentation of intermediate outcomes to the community; * Ownership and sustainability of results are foreseen in the project; * The applicant has already completed the preparatory work, such as business plans completed, some of the activities have already been carried out, and only additional investment to realize the envisaged goals is needed; * Created cultural productions and services will serve local communities even after the end of the Programme period; * Assessed needs - the project justifies needs and relevance of its activities; * Positioning - an analysis of similar practices is provided, avoiding duplication and justifying the uniqueness of the project. | 0 – The planned project model is not sustainable and focuses on short-term results;  5 – Some aspects of the project have proved to be sustainable;  10 – The project foresees sustainability of results but it is not ensured;  15 – The results of the project will continue to have impact even after the implementation phase and are oriented to long-term benefits. |  |
| **6.** | Feasibility of the project | Higher rating shall be given to those projects which have higher chance of delivering project’s results in a satisfactory manner and a reasonable period of time.  Points to be taken into consideration (non-exhaustive list):   * The applicant has or has planned to acquire necessary technical resources to successfully execute this project; * The applicant has considered all of the requirements, laws, and regulations to complete this project; * The solutions indicated in the project are reliable, maintainable, and affordable; * The  project plan is feasible within a reasonable period of time; * There is a clear link between planned activities, implementation schedule, designated budget and outputs; * Necessary management arrangements, skills and human capacity exist within the consortium; * Risk assessment and mitigation is foreseen in the application phase. | 0 – Project meets minimum feasibility requirements;  3 – The feasibility of the project is only partly ensured  5 – The feasibility of the project is demonstrated in a strong manned |  |
| **7.** | Quality of national cooperation and partnership in the project | Higher rating shall be given to the projects in which partnership between national participating organizations have a significant positive impact on the overall quality of the project.    Points to be taken into consideration (non-exhaustive list):   * Due to cooperation with national partners the project is likely to be of better quality than in the case of implementing the project without partners; * Compliance of the scope of activities of the participating organizations with the content-related scope of the project; * Content-related/organizational/financial contribution of the Partner’s to the project. The role and contribution of every participant are clearly defined, justified and substantial; * Project partner (-s) has met with the project promoter during the process of preparing the project application and (or) partner’s active involvement in preparation of the project application can be substantiated in other ways; * The project promoter and (or) partner (-s) already have experience implementing international cultural projects; * The project promoter and partner (-s) already have successful cooperation experience with each other; * The plans to continue cooperation with the partner (-s) after the end of the project are substantiated in the project application. * The project uses local human / organizational resources and networks; * The municipality, its institutions and local businesses contribute to the implementation of the project; * Partners are involved at the earliest possible stage of the project. | 0 – Partnership between participating organisations does not add any additional value;  4 – Partnership between participating organisations brings additional value;  8 – The project has very strong quality of cooperation and partnership between participating organisations brings a lot of additional value. |  |
| **8.** | Bilateral partnership with Donor states’ entities. | Points shall be given to the projects which are developed and implemented in partnership based on the added value with entities from the Donor states (the Republic of Iceland, the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Kingdom of Norway). Points to be taken into consideration (non-exhaustive list):   * Due to cooperation with bilateral partners the project is likely to be of better quality than in the case of implementing the project without partners; * Compliance of the scope of activities of the participating organizations with the content-related scope of the project; * Content-related/organizational/financial contribution of the bilateral Partner’s to the project. The role and contribution of every participant are clearly defined, justified and substantial; * Bilateral project partner (-s) has met with the project promoter during the process of preparing the project application and (or) partner’s active involvement in preparation of the project application can be substantiated in other ways; * The project promoter and (or) partner (-s) already have experience implementing international cultural projects; * The plans to continue bilateral cooperation with the partner (-s) after the end of the project are substantiated in the project application; * Partners are involved at the earliest possible stage of the project. | 0 – Project is not implemented through bilateral partnership with Donor states’;  3 - Partnership with bilateral partner brings additional value  7 - The project has very strong quality of bilateral cooperation and bilateral partnership between participating organisations brings a lot of additional value. |  |
| **9.** | Share of own funds of the project promoter and (or) partner (-s) | Points shall be given to the projects which foresee larger than 10% co-financing (points are awarded only for the share of the own financial contribution exceeding 10%; no additional points are awarded for in-kind contribution of more than 10% of the). | 0 – The project does not foresee larger than 10% co-financing;  3 – The project foresees co-financing between 10% - 20%.  5 - The project foresees co-financing of more than 20%. |  |
| **Total:** | | | 100 |  |

1. **Conclusion of the evaluation:** Positive  Negative

Date of evaluation

1. Regarding approval of the plan of the boundaries of Vilnius old town (unique code in the register of cultural values: 16073) territory and its protection zone; 2010-10-18; Nr: ĮV-512;

   Regarding approval of the plan of the boundaries of Kaunas old town (unique code in the register of cultural values: 20171) territory and its protection zone; 2010-12-14; Nr: ĮV-680;

   Regarding approval of the plan of the boundaries of Klaipėdos old town (unique code in the register of cultural values: 16075) territory and its protection zone; 2012-03-27; Nr: ĮV-204; [↑](#footnote-ref-2)